DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 438 EC 120 276

AUTHOR Smith, Carl R.
TITLE Trends in Programming for Emotionally Disabled and Chronically Disruptive Pupils.
INSTITUTION Iowa State Dept. of Public Instruction, Des Moines.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 9p.
JOURNAL CIT Iowa Perspective; p1-8 Apr 1978

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Delivery Systems; Educational Legislation; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Emotionally Disturbed; Identification; Individualized Programs; Mainstreaming; Observation; *Special Programs; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

The paper focuses on trends in the areas of emotional disabilities (ED) related to identification, programming considerations, and general delivery issues. An increase in the number of children identified as ED has affected the need for more programs and personnel for this group and on public awareness of the disability. Other trends are the use of observation as a means of identification and the use of educational rather than medical or psychiatric terminology. Six programming considerations are discussed including the mandated Individualized Educational Program (IEP), an increasing awareness of the importance of education in the lives of children, the mandated need for accountability, a growing uniformity in program evaluation, mainstreaming, and more intensive and extensive training of teachers. General delivery issues are explored in the following areas: parental and home involvement, the need to advocate for a continuum of program options, the severity of children handled in school settings, and changes in institutional programs. (Author/PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED176438

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Carl R Smith
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IOWA PERSPECTIVE

News of Programs for Emotionally Disabled and Chronically Disruptive Students April, 1978
Iowa Department of Public Instruction

Trends In Programming For Emotionally Disabled and Chronically Disruptive Pupils.

by Carl R. Smith
Consultant, Emotional Disabilities
& Chronically Disruptive

Introduction

One of the advantages of working for a state education agency is receiving a staggering volume of information related to one's area of specialization. This does not imply concurrent assimilation of such data, but at least the scene is set for random interaction with many facts regarding identification, programming, current concerns, past concerns, evaluation, and future concerns, to name a few. The purpose of this paper is to take much of this information, add some thoughts of my own and project "Trends in Programming." Naturally I hope the reader sees some validity to these projections, but I would also consider the paper successful if professional debate occurred over various points as well.

This paper is divided into sections dealing with issues in identification, programming considerations and service delivery issues. Although I have chosen to deal with these trends in discrete units, it is obvious that much overlap exists.

Issues In Identification

Increase

In Iowa there is a slow, steady increase in the number of pupils identified as emotionally disabled (E.D.) or chronically disruptive (C.D.). Yet, we are far from providing appropriate special education services and programs to the approximately 12,000 youngsters who need such options. In September 1975, 1,399 school age and preschool pupils were identified in these two categories. Of these, 790 or 54% were reported as being served in programs specifically designed for them. In September 1977, 2,206 were identified with 1,954 or 89% being reported as served in appropriate special education programs. Concurrent with this increase in identification, the number of categorical instructional programs increased from a total of 97 programs during 1975-76 to 185 such programs during the 1977-78 school year. In addition to categorical programs serving these populations, a number of mildly to moderately involved youngsters are served via multi-disability resource programs. For a listing of the categorical programs in Iowa serving emotionally disabled and chronically disruptive pupils see appendix A.

What are the implications of this increase to the professional? I will address two implications: (1) the need for additional programs and personnel and, (2) the increase in public attention to this type of special education programming.

Brown and Palmer (1977) reviewed 223 training programs in the area of emotional disturbance which were funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped during the 1976-77 fiscal year. These authors concluded that, for the next few years, school districts will most likely be unable to find enough qualified teachers to provide an appropriate special education program for identified emotionally disturbed children. Particular problems are anticipated at the preschool and secondary levels.

In Iowa the most frequently reported difficulty in establishing programs for the emotionally disabled and chronically disruptive is in finding a fully qualified and certifiable teacher. In comparing our present situation with emerging national trends, it appears that this problem is most likely to accelerate. This situation is further aggravated by the reported high attrition rate among teachers of these pupils (West, 1977).

Special thanks to Joe Freilinger and Doug West for their contributions to this paper.

In This Issue:

"Trends in Programming for Emotionally Disabled and Chronically Disruptive Pupils" by Carl R. Smith.

"Time Out in the Classroom: Implications for Special Education" by David L. Gast and C. Michael Nelson.

EC 120276

It appears that the recruitment of E.D./C.D. teachers will require special effort. Along with this, teacher trainers need to be reminded of the growing needs in this area. If such programs respond, and they appear to be doing so, we can avoid many pitfalls associated with the necessity of granting liberal temporary teaching approvals to those who are, at best, minimally qualified to teach in such programs. The importance of the teacher variable in programming for these youngsters has been well documented (Cain, 1964, Haring and Fargo, 1969, LaBenne, 1967). We cannot overlook this.

Another trend I see is increased visibility; both from the general public and our professional colleagues. As a result, we will be expected to prove that the field of behavior disorders is a distinct professional area, and that we professionals have a unique combination of skills for dealing with this population of handicapped pupils. We will be called upon more frequently to "put our money where our mouth is" in providing services to these youngsters. Others may feel that we have decided to stigmatize a significant number of youngsters to build an "empire of their own."

We must be able to show that our services to handicapped youngsters more than justify the use of such terms as emotionally disabled or chronically disruptive. It behooves us to keep in mind a statement made in the study **The Futures of Children: Categories, Labels, and Their Consequences**:

> **Classification of exceptional children is essential to get services for them, to plan and organize helping programs, and to determine the outcome of intervention efforts. There is widely expressed sentiment that classification of exceptional children should be done away with. This is a misguided aspiration. Classification and labeling are essential to human communication and problem solving; we do not wish to encourage the belief that abuses can be remedied by not classifying. What we argue for is more precise categories and more discriminating ways of describing children in order to plan appropriate programs for them. (p. 8)**

Emphasis On Observed Behavior

Another area of change related to identification is increased emphasis on the documentation of observed behavior patterns in identifying youngsters in need of services for emotionally disabled or chronically disruptive pupils. We can no longer rely on such constructs as "clinical judgment" as the primary criteria by which we identify youngsters with behavioral difficulties. O'Leary (1972) has provided us with an excellent review of the shortcomings of this methodology, specifically the validity and reliability of projective techniques and has concluded, "Even when the behavioral criterion is specific, results concerning the relationship of responses on a projective protocol and overt behavior are conflicting." (p. 242) I am **not** meaning to imply that we are no longer interested in the affective status of the pupils with whom we deal. This is still an important component in our identification procedures. But it is a part of our assessment, not the whole!

Could any of us in a hearing or quasi-legal setting justify our role and services without specifically delineating those behaviors, manifested by a youngster, which led to his/her inclusion in our program? As Martin (1975) has stated, "Intervening in someone's life to change his/her behavior is a potential deprivation of liberty sufficient to raise constitutional issues. Such intervention should be limited to behavior which is within the legitimate interest of the institution involved and which actually occurs and is intolerable." (p. 13) Yes – let's remain sensitive to those personal conflicts and crises our pupils may experience. But, let's also realize that we must include specific descriptions, even as precise as frequency counts, of those behaviors which led to a child's or adolescent's inclusion in our programs.

Use of Educational Terminology

Another trend I see in both identification and programming is a further movement away from medical/psychiatric terminology and methodology. Frank Hewett (1969) has cautioned us against the tendency to function as "pseudoneurologists." Added to this should be a caution against acting as "pseudopsychiatrists."

We, as professional educators, have unique skills, methods and vocabulary. What can we do with such syndromes as "symbiotic psychosis" or "obsessive – compulsive neurosis"? We can, however, design and implement programs for youngsters who are consistently exhibiting inappropriate classroom behavior, for the youngster who is the social isolate in the regular classroom or for the youngster who consistently is physically aggressive with his/her classmates. By using such terminology, we are stressing the point that we are specifically trained professionals with skills of our own.

Programming Considerations

A second major area of implications for education comes under the heading of what I term "programming considerations." This area, will cover such concepts as the Individual Educational Program (IEP), accountability, program evaluation, reintegration concerns, and teacher training.

IEP

IEP is a pressing topic of discussion in special education today. As stated in the 1977 annual report of the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped, "In its call for an 'individualized education program' (IEP) for each handicapped child, P.L. 94-142 can be credited with having codified what has long been recognized as superior teaching practice. In doing so it may very well speed the use of the approach for all children." (p. 6)

Public Law 94-142 defines the IEP as follows:

> **The term "individualized education program" means a written statement for each handicapped child developed in any meeting by a representative of the local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit who shall be qualified to provide or supervise the provision of specifically designed instruction to meet the unique needs of handicapped children, the teacher, the parents or guardian of such child, and whenever appropriate, such child, which statement shall include: (A) a statement of the present levels of educational performance of such child, (B) a statement of annual goals, including short-term instructional objective, (C) a statement of the specific educational services to be provided to such child, and the extent to which such child will be able to participate in regular educational programs, (D) the projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of such services, and appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures.**

Let's pause for a moment and discuss what the IEP is not. According to the most recent document prepared in our office, "The IEP does not dictate a particular management system, curriculum, methodology or evaluation paradigm." I think this is an important point to keep in mind. In the field of behavioral disorders there are various management systems, curriculums and methodological considerations from which to choose. In my opinion, no single one has been consistently proven to be superior to all others. Some educators have been trained to program for youngsters out of a psychoeducational framework while others approach teaching from a strong behavioral background. Still others may base our interventions on "ecological" considerations.

Although I feel that you must construct a philosophical base from which to proceed in programming for these pupils, I do **not** advocate the adoption of any single philosophical base as being the only premise from which to plan programs. Rather, I feel that appropriate programs for youngsters with behavioral disorders may be effectively established under any one of several theories which, via subsequent empirical reports, have been found successful in the education of this population.

The choice of a primary philosophical base is dependent on such variables as the teacher's professional preparation, the school setting, the population of youngsters served and the background of the professional team participating in the program. I do, however, feel that it is important for every program to have a stated philosophy and that such a philosophy be consistently reflected in the pupil's written individualized educational program.

Some of you may now ask the question, "If you believe in such flexibility, what about those things you just said regarding minimal prerequisites for identification?" In dealing with overall programming for behaviorally disordered youngsters, I feel that we are in reality dealing with a multi-theoretical approach. Using the dichotomy of program elements as defined by McCauley (1977), I feel that much flexibility of theoretical underpinnings is present in such program elements as operational methods, curriculum and materials. At other program points, such as identification, particular theories may dominate. I **do** feel that pupil identification should be largely behaviorally based. As stated in our definition of emotional disabilities, "The determination of this handicap is largely based on the consistency, intensity and duration of the behavior of concern." **(Rules of Special Education**, 1977)

Assertion of the Importance of the Role Education Plays in Lives of Children

Another trend I see in our state is an intensified assertion of the importance of the role of education in the lives of emotionally disabled and chronically disruptive students. In some cases, especially in those programs termed psychodynamic, we may have looked upon the role of education as being secondary to the therapy needs of such youngsters. Although I do **not** mean to degrade the role of therapy, especially in the lives of those more severely involved youngsters with whom we deal; we are, as educators, of equal status to those other professionals interacting with these pupils. This is a concept we should be stressing via our behavior.

The importance of the role of education in the lives of these children is being stressed in many areas (Departments of Justice and Health, Education and Welfare, 1977, National Society for Autistic Children, 1976). Morse (1969) presents the idea that achievement may serve as a basic therapeutic tool in working with the emotionally disabled child. He states that the therapeutic value of achievement is especially operative when the child has achieved little or nothing in the past. This view is further substantiated on a more theoretical level by Rhodes (1963). He states that the academic needs of emotionally disabled children are based on two statements by Jacques Maritan. The first of these positions contends that the best way to repress bad energies is to liberate good ones. The second states that the art of education is to make the child heedful of his own resources and potentialities.

We must assert ourselves as professional educators. We welcome as much professional input and assistance in providing quality programming to E.D. and C.D. youngsters as is available, and we realize that the youngsters we deal with may have a wide range of program needs which cannot be fully met by instructional personnel. Yet, we must assert the importance of our role as professional educators with the appropriate training to make program decisions regarding the educational needs of these pupils.

Accountability (academic and behavioral)

Paul Graubard (1973) alludes to many of the questions we are being asked regarding special education programming in general. He states:

> **Special education classes in even the least developed programs have lower pupil-teacher ratios and higher per capita costs than regular classes: thus, high taxes and difficulties in meeting school operating costs make evaluation of program effectiveness and justification of expenditures especially important. (256-66)**

This statement points to what I feel is going to be an increased emphasis in our accountability in programming for emotionally disabled and chronically disruptive pupils; in both academic and behavioral areas. No longer will our programs be **assumed** to be adequate. We must be able to prove to our consumers, including our pupils, their parents, regular educators and many others, that our particular programs are beneficial and individually appropriate to the youngsters we serve. Accountability, as described in a recent publication dealing with IEP's **(Iowa**, 1977), includes (1) an ongoing process observed by more than one person, (2) a criteria by which to judge that act as appropriate or successful and (3) persons responsible for performing that act.

You may note I stated that our accountability must be shown in both academic and behavioral areas. One of the traps into which we may easily fall as educators of emotionally disabled and chronically disruptive pupils, is to become so concerned with unacceptable behavior that we overlook other areas, such as academic needs. Most of these youngsters have academic deficiencies; deficiencies which cannot be explained on the basis of other handicapping conditions (Schroeder, 1965; Morse, Cutler and Fink, 1964; Quay, Werry, McQueen and Sprague, 1969; Departments of Justice and Health, Education and Welfare, 1977). We must deal with these academic deficiencies to enable these youngsters to become successful students — a goal for which we strive. Many

professionals contend that achievement precedes adjustment. Even if one chooses not to accept this paradigm, it seems logical to state, "achievement accentuates adjustment and works to maintain it."

Uniformity of Program Evaluation

Another programming trend I see in our state is a move toward more uniform program evaluation. Such uniformity should include both a means of evaluating the success of each individual pupil's program and a means of evaluating the overall educational program. Consistency in this area seems to be lacking in Iowa at this time. In a 1975 special study institute entitled "Implementing Programs for the Emotionally Disabled in the Public Schools," sponsored by the Iowa Department of Public Instruction, 115 professionals working with programs for the emotionally disabled responded to a questionnaire pertaining to the area of program evaluation (**Iowa Perspective**, May, 1976). When asked the means by which they presently evaluated the effectiveness of their programs, the replies varied from responses such as, "limited to program director observation" to "pre-post normative test battery, regular teacher behavior ratings, goal attainment scaling, structured interviewing for consumer satisfaction and program change recommendations." After attempting to group similar responses from this questionnaire one still notes that more than 40 different methodologies were reported by these respondents.

Consistent pupil and program evaluation is vital in determining whether our programs are in fact successful. In evaluating an individual youngster's program we need to address both academic and nonacademic areas. In both areas such an evaluation should be largely based on observed behavior. Documentation of change is essential. Methods of program evaluation also include: documented group academic and behavioral improvement, successful reintegration of pupils, school staff impressions of the program, parental response to the program, and long range school success of the pupils served via such a program.

I see a move toward more uniform program evaluation. I do **not**, however, see this uniformity taking the form of dictated instruments and procedures as the only means by which to evaluate pupil progress and program success. Rather, I see the possibility of our together defining areas that need to be evaluated, for example pupil and class academic progress, and establishing a variety of means and instruments by which to evaluate such a component. By doing things this way, we are assuring that evaluation needs are being met while at the same time allowing for individual preferences within our own professional community. I, too, don't like anyone telling me that there is only one way to do something.

Increased Reintegration

Another programming trend I see for the future is an increased emphasis on the successful reintegration of pupils served in E.D. and C.D. programs. Grosenick (1970) has stated, "One of the most important objectives of special education programs for emotionally disturbed children is to return them to regular education programs as soon as possible. In other words, special education is seen as a temporary intervention which should prepare exceptional children for their return to a regular education program." (p. 113)

The discontinuation of a program or service to pupils identified as emotionally disabled or chronically disruptive should be largely based on the **reduction** in the consistency, intensity and duration of the behavior of the concern. Just as programming for these youngsters must be systematic, the plans we have for reintegration must also possess this property. Successful reintegration is a multifaceted component (Grosenick, 1971). Among the important variables are: the child's behavior change, his or her academic skills, the instructional climate in the regular classroom to which he/she is returning, the skills and motivation of the regular classroom teacher, the administrative support provided to facilitate the reintegration process, parental cooperation and the planning which has been done prior to and during this procedure. The reintegration operation requires careful planning and should be implemented in a phase-in manner rather than an all-or-nothing approach. Plans for reintegration should be a part of every child's written individualized educational program.

I think that we, as professional educators, will be asked more and more frequently what our plans for reintegration are. More importantly, if a pupil remains in an E.D. or C.D. program for an extended period of time, with little progress being shown, someone is going to ask, "Why?" Fortunately, in Iowa we have a team of professionals who will be helping us in this process. The most obvious positive component of this trend is a move away from viewing any of our programs as a dead-end street.

More Intensive and Extensive Training of Teachers

Another programming trend I see for the future is an increased emphasis in the areas of teacher training and teacher inservice. I feel this is an area that cannot be overstressed. Among the areas of concern I have are: (1) the lack of a sufficient number of adequately trained and appropriately certified teachers to staff our instructional programs, (2) the wide diversity in beginning competencies of E.D. and C.D. teachers, and (3) the difficulties encountered in finding sufficient numbers of leadership personnel in these areas.

A United States Office of Education Study (Mackie, Kvaraceus and Williams, 1957) dealt with an evaluation of teaching competencies by teachers. Seventy-five teachers of emotionally disabled pupils, were asked to rate their competencies, both as to their proficiency in each area and each area's importance in teaching emotionally disabled children. The results showed that these teachers, as a group, felt most capable in those areas they considered least important. The teachers felt specifically weak in areas requiring knowledge and application of definite skills and techniques for working with emotionally disabled pupils.

One might consider the above study as not applicable since it was conducted in 1957. However, on a more recent note Brown and Palmer (1977) conclude their review of training programs in emotional disturbance by stating:

> **Over the next few years, the Division of Personnel Preparation (BEH) will respond to changing personnel needs by establishing as a high priority for federal funding, projects focusing on traditionally neglected emotional disturbance personnel areas. With so few teachers currently adequately prepared for the new population of emotionally disturbed children they will**

teach, hope for the full promise of Public Law 94-142 must be placed in preservice and inservice teacher education. (p. 174)

Fortunately, in Iowa, I think that our training programs are beginning to shift their emphasis to deal with this neglected area. I have felt that in the past these programs were geared toward training teachers of the learning disabled or mentally disabled with emotional disabilities being added as an adjunctive area.

A spin-off effect of increased emphasis in teacher preparation is that we will begin to see professionals emerging from training programs better trained than we are. We will be forced to upgrade our skills to keep up with these young "up-starts." Consequently, I see an increased emphasis on inservice training and the consistent upgrading of our instructional skills. Whether the provider of such training is the university, state department, or others, I hope that similar to preservice training, the pressure is applied to make such training meaningful.

General Delivery Issues

This area includes (a) parental and home involvement, (b) the need to advocate for a continuum of program options, (c) the severity of the youngsters we deal with in school settings and (d) changes in our institutional programs.

Parental and Home Involvement

Parental cooperation and participation in our programs helps to maximize the chances of such programs succeeding. This cooperation, under good conditions, exceeds the basic requirements of due process. For example, we may deal with a motivational system that includes both in-school and out-of-school rewards for appropriate behavior. In such a case we may be seeking the display of a newly acquired positive behavior in both school and home settings. In this case, total success is quite dependent on how successful we have been soliciting cooperation from the parents. As noted by Bandura (1969), ". . . behavioral changes established under artificial conditions must be supplanted with generalization training, with respect to both the types of tasks and incentives employed, in order to ensure adequate transfer effects."

In an earlier issue of **Iowa Perspective** (May, 1977) we dealt with the data regarding a youngster's home environment that we need for identification procedures. Such data includes a background of the parents' perception of the problem, the history of their youngster's difficulties, as well as perceived home factors which may be contributing to or maintaining the youngster's difficulties in school. I feel that we should be cautious in determining what data we need beyond this. If we propose to collect very personal data describing a home or family situation I think that we must also be able to justify the collection of such data on the basis of identification issues or implications for educational programming. If we cannot do this, then we have no business requesting such information. I base this opinion on both what I feel are the basic privacy rights of our pupils and their parents, as well as the professional and programming efficacy challenges which can be made if we appear to gather unnecessary information.

Another area which concerns me is what we do in situations in which parental cooperation in ongoing programming is not forthcoming. I feel that, although we realize the importance of such cooperation, we must be ready and willing to procede without it. We can no longer use lack of parental cooperation as a reason for the failure of our programs. In the past I have heard statements such as "the reason John's behavior in school has not improved is because there have not been any changes at home." I do not feel we can justify the nonefficacy of any of our programs on such a premise.

Need for Continuum

Another trend I see is an increase in our advocacy for the development of a full continuum of educational options for the youth we serve. I see this as one of our top priorities in the future. How can we appropriately serve a mildly involved emotionally disabled youngster when the only option available is a self-contained classroom? Likewise, how can we adequately serve a severely involved youngster when the only option available is a resource teaching program?

A mildly involved emotionally disabled youngster, defined by the frequency, intensity and duration of the behavior is best served through such options as professional support to the regular classroom teacher and resource teaching programs. If we try to fit such a youngster into a self-contained program are we meeting the "least restrictive" mandate? Fortunately, I have not often seen such proposals.

When we have the opposite situation, a proposal to place a severely involved youngster into a less intensive and structured program, such as a resource model, we have another problem. In my experience, this is a more common practice. In this case, we fall short in meeting the mandate of providing "an appropriate program" regardless of the lack of restrictiveness in such a proposal.

Both of these instances are examples of what occurs when we do not have a variety of programs available to serve behaviorally disordered pupils. It seems logical that with more options to serve these youngsters, the probability is higher that we will truly provide an appropriate special education program. As Deno (1968) has stated: "The cascade system is designed to make available whatever different-from-the-mainstream kind of setting is required to control the learning variables deemed critical for the individual case. It is a system which facilitates tailoring of treatment to individual needs rather than a system for sorting out children so they will fit conditions designed according to group standards not necessarily suitable for the particular case."

Changes in Institutional Programs and The Effect On Public School Programs

We are beginning to see a much closer working relationship between our public school programs and institutional/residential programs serving emotionally disabled and chronically disruptive pupils. Public Law 94-142 specifically delineates the responsibility of providing an appropriate special education program to handicapped pupils in both our public schools and state and private institutions. Some may feel that with the recent emphasis on "mainstreaming" and "normalization," our institutions will soon be obsolete. I do not agree. To eliminate such programs would also eliminate a vital link in the true continuum of services. Can we afford to eliminate such programs when, in many cases, no comparable service is available at the community level? As noted in **The Futures of Children**:

The bandwagon for community-based programs is gathering momentum, and it is entirely possible that the precipitous closing of large institutions without sufficient preparation in the community to receive and care for the children released may defeat a fundamentally sensible reform and produce a new crisis in caring. (p. 28)

However, I do feel that we need to establish the situation in which our youngsters who need to leave their community for an institutional program will have a continuous educational program with information readily available from one place to the other. Along with this trend will be the application of consistent standards applied to both public school and institutional programs. This includes the area of teacher preparation and certification.

As we develop more programs in our public schools, we are going to be dealing in part with a more severely involved population; a population that may in the past have automatically ended up in our institutional programs. This is based on my belief that in the past a lack of educational options may have contributed to the need for residential programs for many of these young people. We are going to be expected to program for many youngsters who, five years ago, would have been institutionalized for an extended period of time. To me, the possibility of adequately serving these youngsters in school based programs is one of our basic incentives for continuing to advocate for the further development of programs serving emotionally disabled and chronically disruptive pupils.

Summary

As a final note, I would like to share my philosophy of the education of emotionally disabled and chronically disruptive pupils. This philosophy has been shaped by the influence many of you have had on me.

Programs in the areas of emotional disabilities and chronically disruptive should be based on the following assumptions: behavior is a dynamic phenomenon and is amendable to change; appropriate special education programming contributes to positive behavioral change; pupils must be given an opportunity to exhibit their newly acquired, more acceptable behavior patterns; behavior change is necessary for the student's best interest; needs in addition to the behavioral area, i.e. academic, must also be met in these programs; and, these programs provide specific components which cannot be adequately and consistently provided for in other special education or regular education programs.

I feel that the most desirable educational alternative for any handicapped pupil is a program which provides opportunities for such a person to interact with his/her "normal" age peers. I realize, however, that some emotionally disabled or chronically disruptive youngsters cannot function in such a setting for a variety of reasons. When students are removed from the regular educational program they should be placed in the "least restrictive alternative" possible. This must, however, be carefully balanced with the concept of an "appropriate program" in making a program placement decision. For example, to place a severely involved emotionally disabled child in a resource teaching program may meet the "least restrictive mandate," yet fall short of meeting such a youngster's needs as far as an "appropriate" special education program.

I feel that the ultimate goal of any educational program serving these youngsters is to adequately prepare such youngsters for a productive, self-satisfying life, unencumbered by the behavioral difficulties they may have, or be perceived as manifesting, during the school years. I do not consider a goal of our programs to be the shaping of all youngsters into "conforming beings." Rather, I feel that one of our primary goals is to increase the "behavioral freedom" of those youngsters we serve. Behavioral freedom, not in the sense of a license to create havoc in our school classrooms, but rather, freedom to grow into mature productive adults. I believe that this increase in an individual's behavioral freedom includes: (1) achievement, both in and out of school, near one's capacity, (2) the ability to make wise personal decisions, and (3) the capability of living one's life as an individual, yet not being unjustly obtrusive to the lives of others.

This paper has addressed what I think are trends in the areas of emotional disabilities and chronically disruptive related to identification, programming considerations and general delivery issues. I approached this task both eagerly and humbly. After all, the description of trends has to be "in the eyes of the beholder" and subject to valid debate. As I stated earlier, I would be pleased if this paper contributes to our continuing dialogue as to what comprises quality programming for emotionally disabled and chronically disruptive pupils. In closing I am also reminded of a quip once made by Mark Twain, "The trouble with human beings is that they know so many things that ain't so."

Appendix A

Iowa Programs Serving Pupils With Emotional Disabilities or Pupils Identified as Chronically Disruptive (Public School Sponsored*)

Emotional Disabilities	**1977-78**	**1978-79 (proposed)**
Resource Teaching Programs (1.7)		
Elementary		16
Secondary	3	8
Special Class with Integration (1.7)		
Elementary	18	39
Secondary	14	46
Self-Contained Class (2.0)		
Preschool	2	5
Elementary	33	50
Secondary	22	37
Self-Contained - Severe (4.2)	55	68
Itinerant	1	3
Juvenile Facility Based	6	8
Home - Hospital	1	0
Total	155	280
Chronically Disruptive		
Self-Contained - Severe (4.2)	30	57
Grand Total	185	337

*This does not include the approximately 600 emotionally disabled pupils who, during the 1977-78 school year, are being served in multi-disability programs.

References

Bandura, Albert, **Principles of Behavior Modification**, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, 1969.

Brown, Gweneth B. & Palmer, D.J., A review of BEH funded personnel preparation programs in emotional disturbance, **Exceptional Children**, 44:3, November 1977, 168-176.

Cain, L. F., Special education moves ahead: a comment on the education of teachers, **Exceptional Children**, 1964, 30, 211-217.

Deno, Evelyn, Special education as developmental capital, **Exceptional Children**, 1970, 37, 229-237.

Departments of Justice and Health, Education and Welfare, **Learning Disabilities: The Link to Delinquency Should Be Determined, But Schools Should Do More Now**, United States General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C., 1977.

Graubard, Paul, Children with behavioral disabilities, **In Exceptional Children In The Schools**, Lloyd M. Dunn, Ed., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York, 1973, 245-298.

References (Continued)

Grosenick, Judith K., Assessing the reintegration of exceptional children into regular classes, **Teaching Exceptional Children**, 1970, 2, 113-119.

Grosenick, Judith K., Integration of exceptional children into regular classes: research and procedure, **Focus On Exceptional Children**, 1971, 3:5.

Haring, N.G. & Fargo, G.A., Evaluating programs for preparing teachers of emotionally disturbed children, **Exceptional Children**, 1969, 36, 157-164.

Hewett, F.M., **The Emotionally Disturbed Child in the Classroom**, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1969.

Iowa Department of Public Instruction, Individualized Education Program (IEP) Procedures, Division of Special Education, 1977.

Iowa Department of Public Instruction, **Rules of Special Education**, Division of Special Education, 1977.

Iowa Department of Public Instruction, **Iowa Perspective**, Division of Special Education, May, 1975.

Iowa Department of Public Instruction, **Iowa Perspective**, Division of Special Education, May, 1977.

LaBenne, W., A population analysis of teacher characteristics associated with overall change in emotionally handicapped boys, **Psychology**, 1967, 4, (4) 24-29.

McCauley, Robert, Elements of educational programming, **Iowa Perspective**, Division of Special Education, May, 1977.

Mackie, R.P., Kvaraceus, W.C. & Williams, H.M., **Teachers of Children Who Are Socially and Emotionally Maladjusted**, Washington, D.C., United States Government Printing Office, 1957.

Martin, Reed, **Legal Challenges to Behavior Modification: Trends in Schools, Corrections and Mental Health**, Research Press, Champaign, Illinois, 1975.

Morse, W. C., Disturbed youngsters in the classroom, **Todays Education**, 1969, 58, 30-37.

Morse, W. C., Cutler, R. L., & Fink, A. H., **Public School Classes for the Emotionally Handicapped: A Research Analysis**, Washington, D.C., CEC, NEA, 1964.

National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped, **Annual Report**, Washington, D.C., 1977.

National Society for Autistic Children, **Could Your Child Be Autistic?**, Albany, New York.

O'Leary, K. Daniel, The assessment of psychopathology in children, In **Psychopathological Disorders of Childhood**, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1972.

Public Law 94-142, Amendment of Part B-EHA, 1975.

Project on Classification of Exceptional Children, **The Futures of Children: Categories, Labels, and Their Consequences**, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, 1975.

Quay, H. C., Werry, J. S., McQueen, M., & Sprague, R. L., Remediation of the conduct problem child in the special class setting. In **Educating Emotionally Disturbed Children: Readings**, H. DuPont, (Ed.), Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. New York, 1969.

Rhodes, W. C., Curriculum and disordered behavior, **Exceptional Children**, 1963, 30, 61-66.

Schroeder, L. B., A study of the relationship between five descriptive categories of emotional disturbance and reading and arithmetic achievement. **Exceptional Children**, 1965, 32, 111-112.

West, Douglas, personal communication, 1977.